DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 379 514 CE 068 365

TITLE	The Visions Program of Orangeburg-Calhoun Technical College Presents a Conflict Resolution Workshop for the Regional Medical Center.
INSTITUTION	Orangeburg-Calhoun Technical Coll., Orangeburg, SC.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Vocational and Adult Education (ED), Washington, DC. National Workplace Literacy Program.
PUB DATE	94
NOTE	33p.; For related documents, see CE 068 362-367 and CE 068 370-373. Printed on colored paper.
PUB TYPE	Guides - Classroom Use - Teaching Guides (For Teacher) (052)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Basic Education; Adult Literacy; *Conflict Resolution; *Hospital Personnel; Interpersonal Competence; *Job Skills; *Learning Activities; Literacy Education; *On the Job Training; Workshops
IDENTIFIERS	*Workplace Literacy

ABSTRACT

This document contains the instructional materials developed and presented in workshops on conflict resolution at a regional hospital. The workshop covers analyzing conflict and conflict resolution strategies and their effects. The guide includes a workshop mission, overview, information sheets, work sheets, key questions and answers, and role-playing activities. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 379 514

The Visions Program
of Orangeburg-Calhoun Technical College

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

Presents
A
Conflict Resolution Workshop

for
The Regional Medical Center

CE036365

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INTRODUCTION

If we had an ideal workplace, there would be no need for "Conflict Resolution Workshops." But, because there will always be somebody in our work environment who seemingly will continuously try to put others on the spot either because they enjoy seeing one squirm or perhaps because they simply have a personality that intimidates people, such workshops are essential.

When a person knows however, that his superior/co-worker is just gruffy by nature and means no harm but rather, simply expects quick competent answers, then one can be prepared for that expectation. Quite often sarcasm, put-downs or plain rudeness are things we must learn to deal with in order to reduce the conflict/stress on the job, that such people cause. Thus, the intent to this workshop is to help participants become knowledgeable of the personal interactions. Participants will be reminded that sarcastic responses to negative comments in most instances, will only escalate anger and all persons involved will simply be much much further from their original/intended objective. Too, they will be taught how to develop win-win outcomes in any encounter. Participants will become cognizant or better prepared to display self-confidence among the acid--tongued superior/co-worker. Hence, this effort will enable all employees to work together in a spirit of cooperation rather than one of competition!

Orangeburg-Calhoun Technical College's
VISIONS Program
presents a
Conflict Resolution
Workshop
for
The Regional Medical Center

Mission

Overview

Resolving Conflict

Implementation Procedure

Questions/Answer Session

Workshop Evaluation

Pertinent Facts

"Where there is no vision, the people perish"

Proverbs 29:18

Know what you want, not just what you don't want. If you are not absolutely sure of what you want, and are not precise in conveying that information to difficult people, then you should never be disappointed when you get exactly what you don't want.

SIMPLIFIED: A belief, not necessarily a fact, that if you get what you want, I can't get what I want.

WORKSHOP OVERVIEW

I. Analyzing Conflict

- A. The differences between disagreement and conflict
  - 1. Opinions about facts
  - 2. Interpretations of reality
  - 3. Blame for wrongdoing
- B. Primary reasons for conflict
  - 1. Different interest
  - 2. Same interest
- C. The two faces of conflict (when it's good, when it's bad)
  - 1. Good
  - 2. Bad

II. Conflict Resolution Strategies and Their Effects

- A. Yielding
  - 1. Personal wants unimportant
  - 2. Approval from others more important
  - 3. Feelings threatened, punishable, deprived
- B. Withdrawing
  - 1. High concern for self
  - 2. Low concern for others
  - 3. Better alternatives
- C. Inaction
  - 1. Proclamation
  - 2. Denial
- D. Contending
  - 1. Joint gains impossible
  - 2. Others will give in
    - a. Contentious tactics
      - 1. Ingratiation
      - 2. Persuasive argumentation
      - 3. Promises
      - 4. Gamesmanship
      - 5. Threats
      - 6. Irrevocable commitments

b. Problem Solving
   1. Confrontation
   2. Solution

III. Conclusion

RESOLVING CONFLICT
AND
BUILDING BETTER COMMUNICATION SKILLS in the WORKPLACE

INTRODUCTION

Webster defines conflict as a perceived divergence of interest, or a belief that individuals' current aspiration (goals) cannot be achieved simultaneously. Hence, we become continuous negotiators. A person negotiates with his boss about a raise, or with a spouse about where to go for dinner and with children about when the lights go out. Negotiation is a basic means of getting what you want from others. It is simply a back-and-forth communication process designed whereby an agreement can be reached when individuals have shared and opposed interests.

Dealing with conflict and confrontation is one of the most important skills you can learn. Most of us have a certain dread of confrontation --- we fear being cheated; we're scared of letting others know what we really think and feel for fear they'll use it against us; we believe our honesty will hurt others so we avoid confrontation or put on a strong front. Nonetheless, conflict can lead to anger, hostility, and further conflict. Or, it can be used as a powerful problem-solving opportunity.

Conflict can be resolved by denying that the problem exists, smoothing it over, or using power. This leads to win/lose situations. However, if conflict is resolved through collaboration and compromise, you can achieve win/win solutions. Thus, the six steps to transform a conflict into a solution in which both parties can win are as follows:

1. State the problem. Using "I" messages, explain the problem. Allow the other person to state his perception. You may have different problems. This is the time to clearly define the conflict. It's hard to fix something before you both know what's broken.
2. Brainstorm solutions. Dream up as many solutions as you can. Be outrageous. Don't evaluate them. Quantity, not quality, is the key. If you get stuck, restate the problem and continue brainstorming.
3. Evaluate the solutions. Discard the unacceptable ones. This step will require time and honesty. Talk about which solutions will work and how difficult

they will be to implement. You may hit upon a totally new solution.

4. Choose the one most acceptable to all. Be honest.
5. Choose the solution. Decide who is going to do what by when. Keep your agreements.
6. Re-evaluate. Review the effectiveness of your solution. If it works, pat yourselves on the back. If not, be open to making changes or implementing a whole new solution.

No one can successfully resolve conflict without developing the right attitude. For some, conflict can be so intimidating that there is a tendency to capitulate and immediately adopt a lose/win attitude. They always lose and others always win. Gradually, the person who continually gives in develops resentment toward those who are winning. Ultimately, relationships become strained and everyone loses.

The other attitude extreme is win/lose in which one person imposes his or her solutions on others. Unfortunately, these solutions are one-sided, designed to meet only one person's needs. Adults often adopt this "I-know-what's-best-for-you" approach with children, completely removing them from the problem solving. Managers and others in positions of authority may develop this dominating attitude too, handling down solutions rather than allowing employees to participate. Like the lose/win situation, win/lose conflict resolution often builds resentment in the losers. Children may rebel against such domination by doing poorly in school, neglecting chores, or becoming involved in delinquent behaviors. On the job, employees may sabotage, pilfer, or engage in work stoppage or slow-downs.

No one wins with a win/lose or lose/win approach to conflict. In contrast, a win/win attitude allows everyone to have his or her needs met. Win/win conflict resolution leaves all parties feeling satisfied. The first step in developing a win/win attitude is to get rid of the notion that there is only one way to divide up the pie and that your piece must absolutely be the biggest. Instead, adopt the attitude that there are several possible solutions that may be acceptable to both sides. You'll find, in fact, that there are usually many ways to divide the pie. You may even make the pie larger. And you may find that the biggest piece isn't the most important aspect of resolving the conflict after all.

ANALYZING CONFLICT

The difference between disagreement and conflict

You'll eliminate a significant portion of your conflicts by distinguishing between disagreement and conflict, and realizing that you don't have to resolve disagreements.

There are three types of disagreements

1. **Different opinions about facts**
2. **Different interpretations of reality**
3. **Blame for past wrongdoing**

CONFLICT

Two primary reasons for conflict

1. **We have different interests**
2. **We have the same interests which are in conflict**

Two faces of conflict

Most of us dislike conflict. However, it's important to realize when it can be good.

Conflict is <u>good</u> when

1. It is a symptom of discontent
2. It produces change for the better

3. It produces gains, innovations and new ideas

4. It fosters unity and understanding

5. It brings about behavioral changes
   * The disagreement can be so uncomfortable that you change your behavior in order to establish harmony between what you believe and what you do

Program note

When people address conflict, they talk about their interests and get to know each other better. Greater empathy and understanding occurs; people learn that diversity can be handled and can be interesting and productive.

Conflict is <u>bad</u> when

* Conflict escalates

Researchers have identified five levels by which the parties become true enemies.

1. Accusations and threats
   -- Parties get angry, blame, accuse
2. Issues increase rapidly
   -- From one to many
3. Specifics are replaced by general issues
   -- From a specific behavior to the entire relationship
4. Concern for self turns into retaliation
   -- Primary interests of hurting you or getting even
5. The number of parties involved increases
   -- Factions and cliques form

Be alert to the escalation process. It usually happens in this order, so it's easy to predict what will happen next. The earlier you intervene, the better the chance for problem solving.

Conflict leads to hostility and fear

* When struggle leads to stalemate, parties experience negative psychological changes which are often irreversible.

Conflict is suppressed

* Many people's response to conflict is to:
___ Give in
___ Give up
___ Ignore the situation and pretend nothing's wrong

* This is often seen as the only alternative to fighting
___ It only sends the conflict "underground" and channels energy from constructive endeavors to destructive behaviors.

Signs of underground behaviors

* High levels of stress

* Absenteeism, loss of productivity

* Noncooperation or competition

* Chronic complaining

* Sabotage and backstabbing

Conflict Resolution Strategies and their effects

1. **Yielding**

Yielding occurs when
* You have low aspirations
__ You realize what you want isn't that important compared to something else.
* Other's goals are more important than your own
* The relationship is unstable
-- New love, new job
-- The trust level is still low and you feel insecure
* Approval from others is more important
* People feel threatened

-- An expectation of punishment, loss or deprivation

2. **Withdrawing**

Withdrawing occurs when

* High concern for self
* Low concern for others
* People have better alternatives
    -- If I have an alternative that seems more attractive than settling my conflict with you, I can break off without any negative consequences
    -- When the other party withdraws from a conflict, ask if they have a better alternative (especially important for sales)
* People feel spiteful and angry
    -- The classic pouter
* People feel threatened
    -- Fear of an emotional explosion

3. **Inaction**

Inaction occurs when

* Low concern for both parties' goals
    -- The issues on both sides seem unimportant
    -- It's not worth the time or effort to resolve the conflict
* People are afraid of conflict
* People don't want to rock the boat
    -- If the messenger of bad tidings gets shot in your organization, you tend to avoid being the messenger

Confrontation

The first three strategies were nonconfrontational; that is, each party could act (or not act) alone. The next strategy involves both parties.

4. **Contending**

Contending occurs when

* High concern for self and low/no concern for others
  -- "I'm right and you're wrong."
* People are scared of losing
* People feel hostile
  -- "You made life hard for me so I'll make life hard for you."
* People are rigid in their positions
  -- "My way is the only way."
* People believe that joint gains aren't possible (the size of the pie is fixed)
  -- Conflict as a sports event (winner/loser), not as an opportunity for creativity and innovation
* People have the ability to contend
  -- Position, power, resources, better alternatives
* People believe the other will give in
  -- You believe I'm not firm and don't know what I want
  -- I appear to have no good alternatives

Contentious Tactics

A contentious tactic is any influence or pressure people use to get what they want; the concern is primarily for oneself.

A. **Ingratiation**
* Based on the "principle of liking"
  -- The more you like me, the more you'll cooperate

There are four factors that influence the degree to which someone likes us and, therefore, will give us what we want.

1. **Similarity**

2. **Flattery and compliments**
* Especially effective when the other person feels insecure and when delivered following a criticism

3. **Doing favors**
   * Doesn't work if the other person realizes it's being done only to get a favor in return
4. Demonstrating a positive image
   * "Actions speak louder than words"

B. **Persuasive argumentation**

This strategy works by getting others to lower their demands through a series of logical arguments (making them more flexible about their goals). It works two ways:

* Convincing you it will cost me too much
  -- "If I grant your request, it'll cost me my job."
  -- Laying a guilt trip on
* Convincing you it's in your favor to ask for less
  -- "If I grant your request, it'll cost you your job."
  -- The fear factor

C. **Promises**

Offering a carrot, pay-off or reward in exchange for compliance. "If you do this, I'll do that." This is a relatively light tactic that can foster goodwill, but there's good and bad.

The good news

* Promises create a sense of indebtedness which people want to get rid of.

The bad news

* Promises can create excessive dependence.
  -- I won't do it unless you give me something

D. Gamesmanship

There are two types of maneuvers and both can be nasty tactics.

1. **One-upmanship**

* Some gems

-- Taking real or fake phone calls during negotiations with you

-- Lack of eye contact

--Making you sit on uncomfortable furniture

2. **Manipulation**

The major difference between these two tactics is that one-upmanship is intentional and manipulation can be unintentional. Manipulation is often learned early in life.

* Maneuvers to exert emotional pressure, especially guilt, to get what you want.

E. **Threats**

* Making "if/then" propositions with punishment as the outcome (as opposed to promises which result in positive incentives)

* Can be spoken or unspoken

F. **Irrevocable commitments**

Two forms:

1. **Threat of mutual disaster**

* Making a commitment to a course of action which will end in mutual disaster unless you concede to certain demands

2. **Contest of wills**

* Refusing to budge

-- "It's company policy."

-- "Take it or leave it."

* We continue until we hate each other's guts and waste our energy on getting even.

* Finally, we enlist other people to help us fight the battle.

Psychological changes

The psychological changes which occur are not just temporary; they leave an

irreversible impression.

Selective perception

Once I've decided you're my enemy, I'll look for evidence to prove I'm right.

* If I think you're a liar, I'll try to catch you in a lie.
* If I think you're cutting me down, I'll interpret most of what you say as a personal attack.
* If I think you backstab and sabotage, whenever I see you talking to someone I'll think you're gossiping about me
* I'll never notice anything good that you do.

Self-fulfilling prophecy

* Once I see you as an enemy, I'll treat you like the enemy I think you are
* The likely result: You'll give back as good as you get
  -- I'll say you act like my enemy

Ceasing to communicate

* An impasse

* Very seldom, if ever, do we re-establish trust.

* We may work politely together, but we're wary, and bitterness remains.

Problem solving

More often than not, problem solving is the first thing people try in a conflict situation. When it isn't successful, they use contentious tactics, the conflict escalates until it reaches an impasse, and finally they're forced back into problem solving.

Preconditions

You need all four preconditions to be met for problem solving to occur:

1. A concern for mutual gain

* The premise of dual concern: cooperation and enlightened self-interest

--Knowing that helping you meet your interests can help me meet my interests.

* Maintaining or improving the relationship

2. Flexible on solutions, firm on interests
   * Solutions = positions = vehicles
   * Interests = cargo

-- Violation of your interests is reason for conflict

* Being firm on interests and flexible on solutions is the best chance for satisfying both parties and appearing negotiable.

3. Creativity
   * Develop a Plan B
     -- Good alternative to an agreement
     Determine:
     1. What can you do by yourself to pursue your interests?
     2. What can you do by yourself so the other side respects your interests?
     3. How can you bring in a third party to further your interests?
   * Willingness to brainstorm
4. Separate the people and the problem
   * Be soft on people and hard on the problem
   * Two elements influence problem solving
     -- Trust and firmness

The four steps of problem solving

1. Determine if situation is a disagreement or a true conflict of interests
   * If a disagreement, offer one of the four solutions discussed earlier.
   * If a misunderstanding
     -- Ask the person to state problem from his or her point of view
     -- Restate what you heard
     -- State problem from your perspective
   * If it is a conflict, go to Step 2
2. Analyze your interests and their interests
   * Make a list of your interests and prioritize according to
     -- Concessions I can give away
     -- Concessions I can trade

-- Concessions I won't make

* Set reasonably high goals and stick to them
* Discuss the problem before solutions

-- Ask "Why, why not, what if.."

3. Look for possible solutions to both parties' problems
   * Brainstorm solutions; generate ideas together
   * Consult; don't dictate

-- An imposed agreement is not stable

   * Sit side by side to create a feeling of partnership
   * Start with the easy issues, then go on to the tougher ones

4. If Step 3 doesn't resolve the situation, make some mutual low priority concessions
   * Recycle Steps 3 and 4 until you reach agreement
   * Be patient; persist until Plan B becomes a better choice
   * Set a follow-up date and/or put agreement in writing

Getting the other party to problem solve
Often the other party isn't automatically willing to problem solve.

1. Keep your composure
   * Focus on your interests
   * Have a list of your interests to look at; it will

-- Keep you focused on the real issues
-- Leave you flexible on solutions
-- Help you maintain your composure

   * Recognize the nasty tactics

-- Be alert but not overly suspicious
-- Look for multiple clues or incongruent communication

   * Know your hot buttons
   * Pause and "leave your body"

-- Break the automatic link between emotion and action

   * Maintain a healthy skepticism

-- Just because you are paranoid doesn't mean people are out to get you.

2. Play it "side by side", align with the other side.
   * Put yourself in their shoes.

-- See the situation from their perspective, not just your own.
-- Show respect, not hostility.

* Express concern for the relationship.
    -- "I don't want you and me to be enemies."
* Let them save face
    -- Make a reasonable request ("You won't mind if I check this out?")
* Ask questions and use silence.
    -- "What would you do in my place?"
    -- Invite specific criticism.
* Use humor.

3. Let others know you are firm but agreeable to further negotiation.
* Stand up for yourself.
* Pinpoint the behavior.
* Respond to reason, but not to force (or personal attacks).
    -- Let them get it off their chest.
    -- Say "I respond to suggestions a whole lot better than to threats."
    -- Take sarcasm at face value
    -- Sidestep the attack and keep on talking about the problem.
* Warn, don't threaten.
    -- There's a fine line between the two.
    -- Threat: "Here's what I'll do to you."
    -- Warning: "Here's what the situation will be."
* Look to the future
    -- Ask, "What do you think will happen if we don't resolve this conflict?"
    -- "How do we make sure this never happens again?"
* Let them know your Plan B, but always leave the door open.
    -- Example for sulking: "I'm ready to talk when you are. Until then I'll just go about my business."
* You can walk away (break off).
    -- Leave the door open.
* If all else fails, suggest a third party (mediator).

10 on-task communication rules for problem solving

1. Both parties state their problem
* Use "I" statements
* Acknowledge the other's problem and indicate a willingness to help
* No zapping (name calling, put-downs)
* No cross-complaining
    -- Don't answer a complaint with another complaint.

-- Deal with one thing at a time.

2. Let them talk and listen.
   * Don't interrupt.
   * Acknowledge.
   * Restate what you've heard.
   * Offer an apology when appropriate.
3. Ask clarifying questions.
   * Why, why not, what if, etc.
   * Not accusatory "why" questions --- "Why are you being so stubborn?"
   * Use silence.
4. Stay in the present and the future, not the past.
5. All requests for change should be stated in behavioral terms.
   * Don't ask for a change in attitude.
   * Don't ask that the other person "feel" differently.
   * Don't ask the other person to be different.
   * If the request is to "stop doing" something, tell him or her what to do instead.

Mediation

Intervention of a third party

There will be times when a conflict can't be settled by the two people involved. Knowing how to be mediator when two parties have reached an impasse will maintain good relationships at work and at home.

1. Structure communication
   * Set up ground rules for the parties involved.
   * Encourage direct communication when hostility is low.
   * Discourage direct communication when hostility is high.
     -- Shuttle between the two parties.
   * Teach the on-task discussion rules.
   * Set time limits for conflict settlement.

Conclusion

You knew it all the time

There is probably nothing in this booklet which you did not already know at some level of your experience. What we have tried to do is to organize common sense and common experience in a way that provides a usable framework for thinking and acting. The more consistent these ideas are with your knowledge and intuition the better. In teaching this method to skilled lawyers and businessmen with years of experience, we have been told, "Now I know what I have been doing, and why it sometimes works" and "I knew what you were saying was right because I knew it already."

This booklet is about how to "win" that important game --- how to achieve a better process for dealing with your differences. To be better, the process must, of course, produce good substantive results; winning on the merits may not be the only goal, but certainly losing is not the answer. Both theory and experience suggest that the method of principled negotiation will produce over the long run substantive outcomes as good as or better than you are likely to obtain using any other negotiation strategy. In addition, it should prove more efficient and less costly to human relationships.

That does not mean it is easy to change habits, to disentangle emotions from the merits, or to enlist others in the task of working out a wise solution to a shared problem. From time to time you may want to remind yourself that the first thing you are trying to win is a better way to negotiate ---- a way that avoids your having to choose between the satisfactions of getting what you deserve and of being decent. You can have both.

"PETTY CASH SCENARIO"

Mary, a meticulous, hardworking employee, had been with the Ajax Company for seven years before any problem developed with her performance. Mary had started as a secretary and progressively moved up to lead bookkeeper. As such, she was responsible for a large, active petty cash fund. During a spot check, her boss Erwin noticed pencil erasures on expense reports, even though employees had been directed by memo to record their expenses in ink. When Erwin confronted her, Mary confessed to temporarily "borrowing" $700 from petty cash. She explained that her mother had been in and out of hospitals for two years and had exhausted the family's resources and credit. Mary said that she used the petty cash funds to pay her mother's latest bill at the local hospital. Erwin told Mary that he would consult the company president, Henry, and let her know what was decided. When he consulted Henry, Erwin said he didn't want to sidestep his responsibility and, though he planned on making the final decision, Erwin wanted the benefit of the president's thinking. Speaking as a CPA, Erwin said that his course of action was clear: any employee who steals should be terminated. Henry felt uncomfortable applying Erwin's principle to Mary's case, and wasn't sure what to do.

Putting It All Together

Now that you know more about resolving conflict, you can plan to implement what you've learned.

I, _____ want to resolve conflicts more effectively. These are the areas or situations in which I plan to use my new conflict resolution skills:

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

To improve my ability to resolve conflicts, I plan to:

Start Doing_____

_____

_____

Stop Doing _____

_____

_____

Keep Doing _____

_____

_____

Signed_____ Date_____

Source:Compiled using the 1984 change your life data.

How Good Are Your Conflict Resolution Skills?

Take a moment to assess your own conflict resolution skills. Mark the statements that best describe you.

Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	1. I evaluate problems to determine what the tension is really about.
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	2. If I have a difference of values with another, I endeavor to understand and respect the other person's value system.
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	3. I discuss problems when things are calm rather than when emotions are running high.
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	4. I agree on ground rules for discussing a problem before attempting to resolve differences.
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	5. In any conflict, I deal with my own and other's emotions before trying to work on the content issues of the problem.
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	6. I allow the other person to express their views, feelings, and needs without interrupting.
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	7. When discussing a conflict, I show respect for others with the appropriate body language and tone of voice.
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	8. I listen to the other person until I understand his perspective and can state it back to him.
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	9. I use "I" statements when stating my viewpoint.
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	10. I avoid name-calling, sarcasm, or other disparaging remarks.
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	11. I use brainstorming techniques to expand the possible solutions.
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	12. I believe most conflicts can be resolved with both sides satisfied.

If you answered "always" to all twelve questions, congratulations, you're probably already effective at resolving conflict. But, if you're like most people, these conflict resolution questions underscore areas where you could improve your ability to resolve problems.

Source: Compiled using the 1984 change your life data.

My Declaration of Self-Esteem

I AM ME

In all the world, there is no one else exactly like me
Everything that comes out of me is authentically mine
Because I chose it - I own everything about me
My body, my feelings, my mouth, my voice, and all my actions,
Whether they be to others or to myself - I own my fantasies,
My dreams, my hopes, my fears - I own all my triumphs and
Successes, all my failures and mistakes because I own all of me, I can become intimately acquainted with me - by so doing
I can love me and be friendly with me in all my parts - I know
There are aspects about myself that puzzle me and others
Aspects that I do not know - but long as I am
Friendly and loving to myself, I can courageously
And hopefully look for solutions to the puzzles
And for ways to find out more about me - however I
Look and sound, whatever I say and do, and whatever
I think and feel at a given moment in time is authentically me - if later some parts of how I looked, sound, thought and felt turned out to be unfitting, I can discard that which is unfitting,
Keep the rest, and invent something new for
That which I discarded - I can see, hear, feel,
Think, say and do. I have the tools to survive,
To be close to others, to be productive,
And to make sense and order out of the world of people and things outside of me - I own me, and therefore I can engineer me - I am me and

I AM OKAY

Orangeburg-Calhoun Technical College
FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION

SUBJECT: _____
SPEAKER(S): _____
DATE: _____

Welcome
to O-C Tech

Have a productive meeting

1. Introduction

   All Participants

2. Objectives of the program
   Participants in this program will learn how to:
   1. Anticipate and prevent destructive conflict
   2. Deal with disagreement before it erupts out of control
   3. Encourage the expression of differences when confronting them would be beneficial
   4. Manage disagreement with more skill and assurance

3. Key Points: Successfully Managed Conflict Can:
   1. Clear up misunderstandings
   2. Lessen resentments
   3. Help creative solutions emerge
   4. Uncover new issues and problems

4. There are 4 Principles for effective conflict management
   1. Preserve dignity/self-respect
      {In a heated discussion it is easy to say something demeaning. Keep your focus on issues, not personalitites until proven otherwise, assume the other person is expressing a legitimate concern when disagreeing}.
   2. Listen with empathy
      {When you listen to another's views, put yourself in their shoes. Feel the speaker's emotional state. When ideas conflict with what you believe, notice if you discount the speaker's message. If body language or feeling tone communicate as uncaring or hostile attitude, do you respond defensively? You need to listen with a neutrality that suspends critical judgement. When you listen to fully understand you convey the message, "I respect you" as a person. Your thoughts and feelings are important to me whether or not I agree with them.}
   3. Don't expect to change others behavioral style.
      {The reflex reaction to disagreement is desire to change the other person's basic behavioral style. Changing their own behavioral traits is almost impossible in the course of handling a dispute. Focus on what you say and do when you are with a difficult person.}
   4. Express your independent perspective.
      {When you are the one (1) dissenter, (opinion) it is tempting to

surrender your conviction to conform with more popular views. At other times, it is easy to get so embroiled in the heated dispute that you lose yourself and the way to win a battle. Your gift to others is your independent point of view-which requires that you understand and reflect about what really matters to you. Once your perspective and concerns have been shared, be willing to embrace an alternative view that allows action to be taken.}

*Desire outcome: "I honor you and your needs, I take responsibility for letting you know where I stand. We can manage our differences constructively."

NINE STRATEGIC STYLES AND THEIR USE

Nine strategic styles, alone and in blends, are available for managing disagreement. The labels used to identify each style are intended to be non-judgemental. All can be used effectively when well-executed and well-matched to the situation.

SUGGESTED QUESTIONS	Style 1 is MAINTENANCE. How would you define maintenance? What are your thoughts about how it should be used?
KEY POINTS	Maintenance is a unilateral decision to maintain the status quo by avoiding or defining action on differing views. "Don't rock the boat." Such non-engagement is usually constructive only as an interim strategy.
SUGGESTION QUESTIONS	Under what circumstances would you apply the maintenance style? Can you think of an example?
KEY POINTS	Maintenance is useful when you need time to collect information, enlist support, augment resources, or deal with higher priority issues. Also, it gives you time to build rapport, let emotions cool, or allow recent changes to stabilize.
SUGGESTED QUESTIONS	Style 2 is SMOOTHING. How would you define this technique? What common saying would sum up smoothing?
KEY POINTS	Smoothing is selling your views by accentuating benefits and

glossing over, omitting or playing down alternative possibilities. "What he doesn't know won't hurt him."

QUESTION — When would you apply smoothing?

KEY POINTS — Smoothing is helpful when your are clear about your viewpoint, but lack authority to require compliance, or don't have time or energy for a full-scale discussion.

It is also useful when you want to withhold complete information because you feel it would be hurtful to others, or because they lack the maturity to handle it.

QUESTION — Style 3 is DOMINATION. How would you define domination?

KEY POINTS — Domination is the unilateral use of power and influence to gain compliance with your views. "Father knows best."

QUESTION — How would you apply this strategic style?

KEY POINTS — When speed or confidentiality are important; when you believe the others involved have little to offer that would change your mind; or when the isssue is to trivial to waste time discussing, domination is appropriate.

SUGGESTED QUESTION — Style 4 is DECISION RULE. What would be your definition of this style?

KEY POINTS — The Decision Rule strategy is the joint agreement to use an objective rule or external criterion (such as a coin flip, lottery, vote, etc.) as the basis for deciding among competing views. "Play by the rules."

QUESTION — Under what circumstances would you choose to use this strategy?

KEY POINTS — When being fair and impartial is more important than the specific outcome of a disagreement; or when any of the proposed

alternatives is better than a stalemate.

SUGGESTED QUESTIONS — Style 5 is COEXISTENCE. Who can describe this approach? How should it be used?

KEY POINTS — Coexistence is the joint determination to follow seperate paths without animosity. Use as an interim strategy when it's expensive or confusing to operate two different systems in parallel to accomplish the same purpose. "You take the high road and I'll take the low road."

QUESTION — What do you see as the application of this style?

KEY POINTS — Coexistence is appropriate when both parties believe they are right, more compelling evidence is needed to persuade one to change views, and a wrong decision could be irreversible or costly.

SUGGESTED QUESTIONS — Style 6 is BARGAINING. How would you define this style? How does it differ from the styles we have discussed so far?

KEY POINTS — Bargaining is the act of jointly seeking to exchange something one party wants for something the other party wants through offers and counter-offers. "You scratch my back; I'll scratch yours."

QUESTION — When would you apply this strategy?

KEY POINT — Bargaining is effective when each party can gain more from an exchange agreement than the best alternative available if no agreement is reached.

QUESTION — Style 7 is NON-RESISTANCE. What is this approach all about?

KEY POINTS — Even though you disagree with the other person's views, you unilaterally decide to offer no resistance, and to support diligent implementation of required action. "Don't win the battle and

lose the war."

QUESTION — Under what circumstance would you apply this style?

KEY POINTS — Non-resistance is appropriate when you believe the other person has greater expertise than you; or when the issue is minor to you but important to the other person and you want to be seen as a team player.

SUGGESTED QUESTION — Style 8 is SUPPORTIVE RELEASE. What do you make of this approach?

KEY POINTS — Even though you disagree with the other person's views, you unilaterally decide to support and encourage that person's initiative within stipulated limits or conditions. "Time to try wings and fly."

QUESTION — When would you use this strategy?

KEY POINT — When the other person is capable but lacks confidence, and you want to foster initiative and commitment.

SUGGESTED QUESTION — Style 9 is COLLABORATION. How would you define this strategy? What's involved?

KEY POINTS — A joint exploration by participants aimed at developing a synthesis of all informed, relevant views. The integration of views is realized through frank discussion of interests, probing of assumptions, and by empathetic listening. "Two heads are better than one."

QUESTION — Under what circumstances would you choose to collaborate?

KEY POINTS — Collaboration is called for when the issues are too pivotal to be comprised; participants are trustworthy, capable, communicate skillfully and have adequate time for discussion.

Collaboration can also be used when participants want to develop a closer relationship, or when commitment of all parties

to the selected course of action is important for a successful outcome.

DESIRED OUTCOME

Participants will keep Figure 2 on page 34 in their block readily accessible to serve them as a powerfully ally in dealing with differences.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Blake, R.R. Solving Costly Organizational Conflicts. San Francisco: Jassey - Bass, 1984.

Hart, L.B. Learning From Conflict: A Handbook for Trainers & Group Leaders. New York: McGraw Hill, 1985.

Lewin, K. Resolving Social Conflicts. New York: Hayer, 1976.

Thomas, K. Conflict & Conflict Management. In M.D. Donnett (Ed.) Handbook of Industrial & Organizational Psychology. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976>